

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, are 4-30 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 4-6, 12, 13, 15, and 17 have been amended. Claim 3 has been canceled. Claims 18-30 have been added.

I. The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite.

1. In claim 1, line 3, the phrase "between at least two layers, included in a reflection polarizer (a)" is confusing. Is the phrase intended to means "between at least two reflection polarizers (a)"?

Claim 1 has been amended for clarity to state that said polarization element (A) comprises a retardation layer (b) and a reflection polarizer (a), wherein said reflection polarizer (a) comprises at least two layers and said a retardation layer (b) is disposed between said at least two layers.

2. It is unclear which elements (the polarization element (A), the retardation layer (b), the at least two layers or the reflection polarizer (a)) have respective selective reflection wavelength bands of polarized light superimposed on each other to conduct collimation for a diffusion (diffused) light source.

As a result of the amendment to claim 1 discussed in Section 1. above, the properties of the elements are clarified.

3. In line 7 of claim 1, it is unclear how one polarizer can be disposed on both sides of the liquid crystal cell.

Claim 1 has been amended for clarity to state "polarizing plates disposed on both sides of the liquid crystal cell.

4. *In claim 2, line 3, does the reflection polarizer (a) comprise at least two layers?*

Claim 1 is clarified to indicate that the reflection polarizer (a) comprises at least two layers.

5. *In claims 3 (lines 6, 7), 4 (lines 6, 13, 15), 5 (lines 7, 9, 12), 6 (lines 7, 9, 12), 13 (lines 3 6), and 15 (line 5), the parentheses are confusing because it is unclear whether the information within the parentheses is the limitation or not.*

The parenthesis and the terms therein have been removed. Additionally, “an angle of 45° (-45°) $\pm 5^\circ$ ” has been clarified.

6. *In claims 4 and 5, last line, do “the respective slow axes thereof” refer to the slow axes of the layer (b2) on the incidence side and the layer (b2) on the emission side?*

Claims 4 and 5 have been amended for clarity to indicate that the angle is between the slow axis of the layer (b3) on the incidence side and the slow axis of the layer (b3) on the emission side

7. *In claim 6, lines 8 and 10, to which layers the layer on the incidence side and the layer on the emission side refer?*

The “layer” of claim 6 has been clarified.

8. *In claims 7-11, the recited feature “the retardation layer (b1)” lacks antecedent basis.*

Claim 1 is amended to recite the retardation layer (b) comprises a layer (b1). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 7-11 are definite.

9. *In claim 17, to which layers the each of layers refer?*

Claim 17 is clarified to indicate all of the layers are laminated using an adhesive.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' claims are clear and definite and it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

II. The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 10, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over JP 10-321025 (JP'025) in view of JP 2002-258048 (JP'048).

The Examiner has indicated that the subject matter of claims 3-9 and 11-15 is allowable.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 3 and claim 3 has been cancelled. Additionally, claims 4, 5, and 6 have been written to be in independent form. Claims 2, 10, 16 and 17 all depend from amended claim 1.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of pending claims 1, 2, 10, 16 and 17 is neither taught by nor made obvious from the disclosures of JP 10-321025 (JP'025) in view of JP 2002-258048 (JP'048), and it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that their claimed invention is allowable and ask that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully solicited.

Amendment under §1.111
Application No. 10/512,050
Attorney Docket No. 042869

If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local exchange number listed below.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Lee C. Wright
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,441
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

LCW/klf